

### REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

To place the subject application in better form, the specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. Also, a revised abstract is presented in accordance with preferred practice. No new matter has been added by these changes.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-12 are presented for consideration. Claim 1 is independent. Claims 1, 2 and 5 have been amended to clarify features of the subject invention. Support for these changes can be found in the original application, as filed. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action.

Figs. 18A-18C have been labeled as --Prior Art-- in the accompanying Letter Transmitting Corrected Formal Drawings. Favorable consideration is requested.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection are requested.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Japanese Laid-Open Patent Application No. 7-267192 (Yagishita) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,196,529 (Shtarkman et al.). Claim 4 was rejected under § 103 in further view of U.S. Patent

No. 5,876,012 (Haga et al.). Claims 7-12 were rejected under § 103 in further view of U.S.

Patent No. 6,496,248 (Tanaka).

Applicant submits that the cited art, whether taken individually or in combination, does not teach or suggest many features of the present invention as previously recited in Claims 1-13. Therefore, these rejections are respectfully traversed. Nevertheless, Applicant submits that independent Claim 1, as presented, amplifies the distinctions between the present invention and the cited art.

As is recited in independent Claim 1, the present invention relates to an anti-vibration apparatus including a first permanent magnet unit magnetized in a first direction perpendicular to a second direction in which a support target is supported, and a second magnet unit including a pair of second permanent magnets, the pair of second permanent magnets being arranged without contact with the first permanent magnet unit such that the same magnetic poles of the second permanent magnets oppose each other through said first permanent magnet unit. Sizes of the first permanent magnet unit and the second magnet unit are set such that no force acts between the first permanent magnet unit and the second magnet unit in a relative positional range between the first permanent magnet unit and the second magnet unit in a third direction perpendicular to the first and second directions.

With the above arrangement, due to the relative position of the first permanent magnet unit and the second magnet unit, the spring constant (stiffness) in the third direction can be controlled. For example, at the critical position, the spring constant can become substantially zero, and no displacement occurs, in a case where an external force (vibration) is applied.

Yagishita is directed to a helicopter with an anti-vibration unit. Electromagnet 3 and two electromagnets 4 are arranged for supporting the cabin of the helicopter. Magnet 3 is interposed between magnets 4.

However, Applicant submits that in Yagishita magnet 3 and magnets 4 are arranged in the same direction in which the cabin is supported and the magnets are magnetized. That is, the anti-vibration unit disclosed in Yagishita cannot control forces in a third direction perpendicular to first and second directions. Accordingly, Yagishita fails to disclose or suggest at least a first permanent magnet unit magnetized in a first direction perpendicular to a second direction in which a support target is supported, wherein sizes of the first permanent magnet unit and a second magnet unit are set such that no force acts between the first permanent magnet unit and the second magnet unit in a relative positional range between the first permanent magnet unit and the second permanent magnet unit in a third direction perpendicular to the first and second directions, as is recited in independent Claim 1.

Thus, Yagishita fails to disclose or suggest important features for the present invention recited in independent Claim 1.

Shtarkman et al. relates to a spacecraft antenna vibration control damper. A damping response can be changed according to the magnitude of an electric or magnetic field applied thereto. Shtarkman et al. was cited by the Examiner for teaching the alternative of replacing an electromagnet with a permanent magnet. Haga et al. was cited for teaching the use of an electromagnetic actuator and Tanaka was cited for teaching the use of an anti-vibration apparatus

in a device manufacturing apparatus. However, these citations are not believed to remedy the deficiencies of Yagishita noted above with respect to independent Claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the present invention, as recited in independent Claim 1, is patentably defined over the cited art.

Dependent Claims 2 and 4-12 also should be deemed allowable, in their own right, for defining other patentable features of the present invention in addition to those recited in independent Claim 1. Further individual consideration of these dependent claims is requested.

Applicant further submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010 All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark A. Williamson", written over a horizontal line.

Mark A. Williamson  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DC\_MAIN 195404v1